

PLANNING AHEAD

Notes for the Planning Community

Volume 1, Issue 2

March 1998

In This Issue

STOCKTON'S STATEMENT.....	1
A WORD FROM THE EDITOR.....	3
EVALUATING PLANNING ORGANIZATIONAL PROPOSALS.....	3
DRAFT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING DISTRICT REORGANIZATIONS - A PLANNING PERSPECTIVE.....	4
QUESTION AND ANSWER ON NEW PROJECT MANAGEMENT REGULATION (ONE OF MANY).....	5
56TH MEETING OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD (EAB).....	6
COASTAL AMERICA - PARTNERSHIP AWARDS.....	6
CEERIS.....	8
SHORE PROTECTION POLICY.....	9
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY BUY-OUTS.....	9
ECONOMIC GUIDANCE MEMORANDUM NO. 99-3: FY 98 UNIT DAY VALUES FOR RECREATION.....	10
ECONOMIC GUIDANCE MEMORANDUM NO. 98-4: NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM OPERATING COSTS.....	10
MODEL AGREEMENTS.....	11
PROMIS DEVELOPMENT FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAMS.....	11

DUAL CAREER TRACK.....	11
RECRUITMENT FOR PROGRAM MANAGER.....	13
DEADLINE.....	13

Stockton's Statement

The new project management (PM) Engineer Regulation (ER 5-1-11) is on the street. I would like to thank all of you that provided comments on the previous draft versions and those of you who expressed your views to me personally. If you have not read the final version, I urge you to do so. Although the guiding principles remain unchanged, the content has changed substantially from earlier versions.

I understand the concerns expressed by many of the folks in the Planning and Engineering communities. At the same time I continue to be amazed at how folks are interpreting the regulation. I believe it is flexible enough to fully implement the Project Management Process AND build a strong program in the process.

I know that many of you are threatened by the impending changes that may affect your organization. Don't be. The debate is over. Now is the time to embrace the principles of the Engineer Regulation (ER). Use them to promote teams and collaboration. Let's use our skills and energy to solve problems, not create them.

I also know that many of you see this as a significant loss to the Corps and your functional community. It will be only if you let it. The sooner you complete the grieving process and reach acceptance of reality (and believe me this is reality) the better off we all will be.

The following article was taken from an article written by Fred Caver for the Programs Management Newsletter. I support these views.

"After what seemed to me to be an especially long, agonizing process, we now have a new Engineer Regulation on programs and project management. It was fascinating to me to see the incredibly wide variety of reactions and comments expressed during development of the ER. They ranged from adamant opposition (often based on incorrect inferences) to criticism that it doesn't go far enough (which included those whose reaction was "no real change, no big deal")."

"It's not really possible to satisfy or convince the adamant opponents. Suffice it to say that the Chief believes that it's crucial to the survival and continued relevance of the Corps for us to become more efficient and responsive in an era where our customers have real choices as to where they take their business. Our world has changed -- and continues to change quickly. Organizations that cannot maximize their effectiveness across organizational and geographical boundaries will be replaced, and the Corps has traditionally been very rigid in these areas."

"Those folks who assert that the new ER contains no real change are more worrisome to me. I suggest they are VERY wrong. A few of the more significant changes include the following:"

--we will take a corporate approach to our business and define success differently. In the past we've tended to define ourselves as planners, designers, operators, real estate

specialists, construction managers, etc. Success was defined by producing a good product within one's specialty. The ER envisions a Corps where success is dependent on a finished project that meets the customer's objectives, and the project team members plus everyone else supporting them is focused on his or her role in successful project delivery or program execution."

--the definition of program management is broadened to cover ALL WORK done by a district or division. This permits all commitments and resource demands to be aggregated and analyzed in one place (under the purview of the DPM), reviewed in a corporate environment, and the Commander to be appropriately engaged in critical decision-making in a timely fashion. Heretofore, as much as 50 percent of a district's workload was not included in the program management system. This ER affirmatively changes that."

-- the role of the functional chiefs is substantially different. Although still responsible for the individual products that make up a project, their roles principally become ones of developing and retaining qualified people, assuring that the necessary systems and environment are in place to permit professional, technically sound products to be produced, acting as senior technical advisors to the Commander and serving as members of the district's corporate board. Again here, the emphasis is on collaborative interaction rather than unilateral control."

--the role and qualifications of a project manager will change. In selecting project managers, the emphasis will first be on leadership, managerial, communication and conflict resolution skills as primary factors -- and then technical qualifications. Further, project managers will assume significantly more authoritative, responsible and visible positions in the organization -- extensions of the Commander -- than previously."

"These are only a few of the changes envisioned. If I had to characterize the essence of the shift contemplated by the ER, it would be to turn the Corps into a single, efficient organization with a common purpose and capable of corporate, coordinated, integrated action. The change is at least as significant as the one we took as a result of Initiative 88 which established the life cycle PM concept in the Corps or when ER 5-7-1 was released several years ago. Stay tuned, it's going to be fun." ❖

A Word From The Editor

Harry Kitch – CECW-PC

We are continuing our quest to improve communication for our community. The Policy, Engineering, and Programs Divisions publish newsletters and post them on their Web sites. You can find them at:

Policy Update

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwa/document.htm#UPDATES>

Engineering Notes

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwe/notes/>

Programs Management Newsletter

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/prog-man/pmnews.htm>

We are also publishing the issues of **Planning Ahead** at:

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwp/news.htm>

We certainly would like to be able to include information in **Planning Ahead** from those of you in the districts and divisions. We are looking for articles on the art and science of planning, the planning organizations, new approaches, new ideas, and anything you would like to share with all your fellow planners. Please send your articles to me via e-mail via the Corps system or through the Internet to harry.kitch@usace.army.mil. Please

make sure that you include the word "newsletter" in the subject line.



Evaluating Planning Organizational Proposals

Steve Stockton – CECW-P

We are receiving many inquiries regarding planning organizational proposals. In August of last year, Dr. Dickey sent out the following E-mail note.

"The pressures to reduce costs are driving organizational changes in divisions and districts with small planning programs. Also, the duplication and overlap between study managers and project managers is a problem crying for a solution. These problems are being responded to in a variety of ways. NWD, SWD and SAD, in particular are looking at and testing options."

"I have stressed two themes in all my discussions on this matter. 1. Planning a project requires the effective interaction of an interdisciplinary team and a leader who can effectively communicate with and respond to the sponsor, concerned agencies and the public within the policy and guidance governing Civil Works projects. Organizational structures that do not facilitate effective interaction among the disciplines and which do not allow appropriate individuals to lead the planning process will not have successful planning programs. 2. Competent staff in all of the planning disciplines require that there must be meaningful career paths and real opportunities for folks in the non-engineering disciplines to have career growth."

"The new PM regulation is in its early stages of development. I have expressed these views to Fred, and, believe he appreciates the concerns expressed above."

"What really needs to happen is that the planning resources need to be more

concentrated. Having one, two or three of any discipline is not maintaining expertise. To become expert there must be opportunities to interact with and advance within a discipline. The willingness and ability of the organization to focus resources geographically is problematic - unfortunately."

In an effort to express our views consistently, and to be compliant with the new PM regulation, I asked John Burns to put together some evaluation criteria. A draft of those criteria follows. Please forward any comments you may have to John Burns or myself.

Draft Criteria For Evaluating District Reorganizations - A Planning Perspective

1. Does the proposal enhance or detract from the capability of the organization to manage the multi disciplinary team development of pre- and post-authorization decision documents that meet technical and policy requirements (study management process)?

a. Is study management/project management duplication eliminated? Does elimination of the SM/PM duplication occur by eliminating SM's?

b. If management responsibilities are split between organizations is it an efficient split, consistent with the size of the program and organizational staffing levels?

c. Is the capability to produce decision documents enhanced and is it sustainable?

2. Does the organization retain a Planning mailbox?

a. Who is accountable for the technical (and policy) quality of decision documents? Is

the capability sustainable? Is there a clearly identified "chief" or senior planner?

b. Is there a capability to directly advise the District Engineer on the planning, policy and authorization issues related to studies and new start projects? (i.e. at a grade that has direct access to the DE)

3. Are career paths retained?

a. Are career paths for technical folks maintained? Will we be able to hire and retain adequately talented people?

b. Are career paths for plan formulation folks retained?

c. Must all PM's be 810's? Are all disciplines included?

d. Do senior positions in career paths contain requirements that can not be met by individuals reorganized into those organizations?

4. Is there a way to continue to do the things that planning typically does? Planning has traditionally served at least 4 functions [marketing, GI & CAP & Environmental Restoration, project planning, tech assistance (FPMS, Sec 22), and SFO]. Where in the new organization is the technical and management expertise to provide these services?

5. Does separating organizations that are currently combined in planning result in a loss in functionality or efficiency?

6. Are "planners" so dispersed that normal experience-based professional development does not occur?



Question and Answer On New Project Management Regulation (One of Many)

The question: PM Regulation - Can Study Management and Plan Formulation Be Separate?

Response from Sam Tosi – CENAD-ET-P:

Fred, this may be too late, but here are my thoughts about your question.

I believe the answer depends on the stage you are in and the definitiveness of the project and scope of effort.

Unlike the design or construction stage, the Planning stage is very susceptible to the duplication of PM/SM duties (perceived or actual), simply due to the nature of the work. The study process is centered on continuous coordination with the study team, non-Federal sponsors and an array of Federal/non-Federal agencies as an integral part of the project formulation process. While coordination and study management are key roles of the Project Manager, it hardly seems efficient to have a Senior Planner (study manager) leading and integrating the project formulation dynamics, while having the PM be the link to outside Corps interests or direction through work assignments to the Corps study team. Conversely it can not be expected that the Project Manager should be an expert in Plan Formulation as to do both the Senior Planner's and PM function.

I would propose a process where there is some duplication but I believe it makes sense. Have the Planner (Senior Planner) develop the 905b. Introduce the PM while the PSP is being developed by the Study Manager. Have PM involved in negotiations for FCSA as the main Corps person responsible for delivering the project. The Study Manager should take the outside contract lead doing the Feasibility plan formulation stage with a sub-contract to the PM for completing the formulation portion and feasibility study, in accordance with the PSP. During the later stages (after a plan has been

developed) the PM would take the lead with outside interests as the PMP is developed and the feasibility stage turns to the questions of how the feasibility plan will be implemented with the questions of how the feasibility plan will be implemented with the planner than as part of his teams. The study management probably would work best with the PM in charge but granting the Study Manager (Senior Planner) substantial latitude with the confines of the PSP to get the job done. He then could oversee this effort while ensuring the commitment of district resources to support the planning effort. The PM is in charge during the later feasibility stage actions; PED, construction and turnover would be under the direct authority of the PM.

While there is some duplication in this arrangement, I do not believe it is substantial. It provides the PM with his/her role of being there to guarantee the sponsor the completion of the feasibility study and project, enhances his role as the plan (project) begins to take shape towards the approval of the plan and its implementation. The delegation to the Senior Planner of getting the feasibility study completed with the context of the PSP affords the PM the ability to oversee this task while concentrating his efforts to insure that the District is resourcing the project as necessary. While bringing the PM in the process increasingly during the feasibility stage allows him to get a better feel for the many issues and their resolution for this benefit during the latter stages.

I know that this may be closer to the old model than a new matrix approach, but I believe if there is going to be some (perceived) duplication, it is better in the area focused on execution of the plan and (project). I do not believe that they are the same. Focus of the study is to get a plan approved, which satisfies the customer and Federal criteria. While the focus of the project manager should be what does the Fed/non-Fed need to do during the feasibility study and immediately afterward to get this prepared for Federal budgeting and construction in the desired time frame,

including land acquisition, permits, PCA's financing plans, local budgets etc.

Think about this approach. You may be able to fine-tune it.

Answer from Fred Caver – CECW-B

Sam:

I understand the approach you've suggested and, previously, would probably have argued in favor of it. However, after the discussions around here with the Chief recently in finalizing the ER, I suspect it has been overtaken by events. Specifically, the Chief has said definitively that there WILL NOT be any overlap in management responsibilities, there WILL NOT be any TMs (study managers fall into this category) and a PM will be assigned at the first indication that work is to be assigned to the Corps/District.

I would also suggest that we all need to rethink what the new ER really means. Too many people, in reading it for the first time, don't see much change. I suggest they are wrong. One of the real keys is to move all of our processes to a corporate (read team) approach. The PM's primary role is to lead this team. This applies to planning too. The entire process, from a study resolution to operations and maintenance, should be viewed as a continuum rather than separate activities that move from "box to box." There will certainly continue to be senior planners -- as members of the teams; they can play a leadership role in formulating plans/solutions without being the lead interface with the customer.

All of this may sound radical, but it's the direction I see us moving in. We've too long identified ourselves with the organizational "box" on an org chart that our names are in, rather than focusing on the ultimate objectives of the corporate body. Our goal is to permit folks to work and think outside of their specific areas. Don't think of "planning" as an objective in its-self. Big mindset change, but very important. Call me if you would like to discuss further. You, because of your experience and

position, are key to communicating this change in NAD. It's crucial that you understand.

Fred



56th Meeting of the Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board (EAB)

Cheryl A. Smith, CECW-PD

The next meeting of the EAB will be 28 - 30 April 1998 in St. Paul, Minnesota. The topic is Watershed Planning. During an Executive Meeting on 15 January 1998, Lieutenant General Joe N. Ballard accepted the recommendation that the EAB conduct a series of general meetings devoted to this topic. The first of these meetings is being hosted by the St. Paul District. A flyer, including hotel and registration information, is currently being prepared. The technical program will focus on identifying and better understanding the issues related to watershed planning in both the Civil Works Planning and Regulatory Programs. Attendance by District staff working on watershed studies in both of these programs is encouraged. The Executive Secretary for the EAB is Mr. Paul Rubenstein, CECW-AG, (202) 761-1257. The Technical Coordinator for the 56th Meeting is Ms. Cheryl Smith, CECW-PD, (202) 761-0136.



Coastal America - Partnership Awards

Norm Edwards – CECW-PD

Coastal America is seeking nominations for its Partnership Awards Program. These awards recognize outstanding partnership efforts and/or multi-agency projects. The awards will recognize two categories: Process and Project. Nominations are due by March 6, 1998. Mail

nomination to: Coastal America, Reporters Building, Suite 680, 300 7th Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-0599

CRITERIA:

At least three Federal partnership agencies must be involved in the process/activity. State and non-governmental organization (NGO) involvement will be recognized for additional credit.

Process/Project must clearly demonstrate the "value added" of the partnership effort. A single agency acting alone must not have been able to accomplish the Process/Project.

Process/Project must demonstrate an innovative/unique way of integrating the objectives of the partnership's agencies' programs with those of Coastal America.

Process/Project must demonstrate a contribution to Coastal America's objective to protect, preserve, and restore the Nation's coastal eco-systems while contributing to the economic vitality of the affected region.

NOMINATION PROCESS:

The nomination must address all the questions below and may not exceed 3 pages in total (1500 words). Please include the multi-agency team name at the top of each page.

1. What is the name of the nominated team?
2. Who are the team members, their agency affiliation, and mailing addresses? How did the team demonstrate the "value added" of a partnership effort?
3. Has the project/process been endorsed by a Coastal America team?
4. Describe the process or project being recognized. Emphasis should be placed on the creative/novel elements of the activity.

5. What are the most significant achievements of the process or project?

6. Explain how the process or project contributes to the objectives of Coastal America to protect, preserve, and restore the Nation's coastal ecosystems while contributing to the economic vitality of the affected region.

7. Describe any other innovative aspects of the partnership process or multi-agency project.

Nomination is for:

_____ Process Partnership Award

_____ Project Partnership Award

RECOGNITION PROCESS:

Nominations will be reviewed by the appropriate Regional Implementation Team and the National Implementation Team.

Final determination on the annual recipients of the Coastal America Partnership Awards will be made by the Coastal America Principals.

Notification will then be made of these selections to the winning Project/Process team leaders. A ceremony for the presentation of the awards will be scheduled in an appropriate location by the team and the Coastal America Coordinating Office.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

<u>REGION /POC</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Northeast - Bill Hubbard (NED)	(617) 647-8552
Mid Atlantic -John Wright (NAD)	(212) 264-7813
Southeast - Dennis Barnett (SAD)	(404) 331-4580
Gulf of Mexico – Buddy Arnold (MVD)	(601) 634-5836
Southwest - Robert Vining (SPD)	(415) 977-8171
Northwest -Owen Mason (NWD)	(503) 230-5428
Alaska - Guy McConnell (POA)	(907) 753-2614

Pacific Ocean - Paul Mizue (POD) (808) 438-8880

Great Lakes - Eugene Fleming (LRD) (312) 353-6320



CEERIS

Barry Kennedy - CECW-PC

Bruce Thornton – CESAM-PD-ER

You may have heard that CEERIS is coming? What is CEERIS? CEERIS (Corps of Engineers Electronic Recordkeeping Information System) is an electronic recordkeeping system. Instead of relying on metal file cabinets, CEERIS relies on an optical disk imaging system. This is a logical extension of the way we do work today; virtually every document is prepared as an electronic file and we rely on e-mail more than we do on written notes. Thus it makes great sense to have a way of storing and retrieving these electronic documents, just like we store and retrieve paper documents. CEERIS also provides a tool for converting the old paper files to electronic images

Locally, CEERIS provides a tool by which the District can move toward the paperless office concept, with each employee being able to access files through the local area network. It also means that each District's final files will be directly accessible Corps-wide to those who have the proper accesses. To learn more about CEERIS, visit:

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/im/ceeris/ceerislist.htm>

Here in the Planning Division at HQ, we have been watching its development with great anticipation. And now, the first Corps Planning element is implementing it. We have reviewed Mobile District's plan to implement it in the Environmental Resources Planning Section of the Environment and Resources Branch. We concurred in their plan as submitted. We also asked Bruce Thornton, the Section Chief, for

his thoughts on the process of implementing CEERIS and his expectations. Those questions and Bruce's answers follow:

Q. It appears that your Information Management (IM) organization actually did the plan. Is that so? If yes, did your Branch play an active or passive role in development of the plan? We're not suggesting that the Branch should be in control of the plan, just asking because it may help us when we review the plans for other Planning implementations.

A. The plan was actually a combined effort by Planning Division (PD) and IM personnel. IM was the lead organization but PD developed its own work flow processes. It is very important that IM and PD collaborate in the development of this plan. Each organization has key roles and information responsibilities that are combined into an implementable plan.

Q. Having gone through the planning phase of the process, do you or your E&R Branch have any advice for other Planning organizations who will be doing this?

A. Yes, don't try to transfer your existing workflow process into CEERIS. This is an opportunity to improve office work process, reduce paper file storage requirements, and have instant access to an well-organized and easily accessible filing system. Take advantage of this opportunity and make it work for you.

Q. The \$117,000 up-front cost is significant for just one section of one branch. Will this hardware be able to handle additional sections or branches later on?

A. The \$117,000 is a District cost. The Section is not investing any additional dollars in hardware; they are using existing automation (ADP) equipment. There are additional costs

associated with the implementation of the system. These costs include the purchase of software and labor costs to input the information into the system. Hopefully, once CEERIS is up and running these costs should decrease to our normal administrative records keeping cost.

Q. The goal of CEERIS is, as your plan points out, to become more efficient. We have no doubt that it will achieve that goal, but we can't help but think that it may also help us to become more effective, too. Do you agree?

A. There is no doubt this system will make our office more effective. The large volume of correspondence and documents PD produces will be easier to locate and use in an electronic format. Since CEERIS has a search capability, employees will be able to search specific topics and retrieve the information at his or her desk.

Q. In developing the plan and implementing it, did you encounter any internal organizational resistance, i.e., people wanting to hang on to the idea that they just have to have hard copies of everything? If yes, do you have any strategies in mind for overcoming it?

A. Yes, the section implementing CEERIS also manages the historic resource program for the District. Therefore, there was some reluctance to relinquishing files with original documents. Alternatives were discussed and agreed procedures were adapted to store official original documents off site. In most cases, these file storage options were already available.

Q. We also notice that the maintenance of the system seems to rely heavily on the IM organization. Are you comfortable with that?

A. IM currently maintains the District's ADP system and performs routine backups which are stored at an off site location. I do not think we want to get into the business of maintaining ADP information and backing it up. I feel IM is the correct office for this function. Chapter 6 of the report covers the Backup and Restoration, Off Site Storage and Archives, and Security for the CEERIS in more detail.

Q. As you go through the process of actually implementing it, we would appreciate receiving any "lessons learned" so we can share them with other Planning organizations while they are still in the planning phase.

A. Once the CEERIS is operational; we will provide you feedback on our successes and challenges. Thanks for your review and comments on this very significant effort.



Shore Protection Policy

Harry Shoudy – CECW-AA

The Office of Management and Budget intends to host a meeting of shore protection stakeholders to discuss possible changes to the Administration's shore protection policy established for the FY 96 budget and maintained through the FY 99 budget.

More information will be forthcoming as this issue develops.



Federal Emergency Management Agency Buy-Outs

Barry Kennedy - CECW-PC

When FEMA buys out a damaged property, the deed becomes encumbered by a perpetual

open space restriction. Unfortunately, under FEMA policy, this restriction prohibits the placement of levees or other flood control features on the land. We should warn our sponsors, in the wake of a flood, to hold off accepting FEMA buyouts until after they have decided whether and where they may wish to run levees.



Economic Guidance
Memorandum No. 99-3:
FY 98 Unit Day Values for
Recreation

Lillian Almodovar – CECW-PD

This memorandum updates the estimated value of a recreation user day provided in Table 6-28 of ER 1105-2-100, Conversion of Points to Dollar Values. These values will be used to estimate the NED effects of project recreation when using the Unit Day Value Method. For FY 98, general recreation values range from \$2.57 to \$7.71; for specialized recreation they range from \$10.45 to \$30.54. If values outside the published range are applicable to a given project, recreation project effects should be evaluated using the Travel Cost Method or the Contingent Valuation Method. If benefits to specialized recreation activities are claimed, these should be based on a regional model or site-specific study. For additional information contact Lillian Almodovar, CECW-PD.



Economic Guidance
Memorandum No. 98-4:
National Flood Insurance
Program Operating Costs

Lillian Almodovar - CECW-PD

The current updated operating cost per policy is \$121, effective immediately. Operating costs per policy for previous years are enclosed for your information. Questions related to this memorandum should be addressed to the CECW-PD staff at telephone number (202) 761-8568.

**National Flood Insurance Program
Operating Costs Per Policy**

The cost numbers summarized below represent an estimated average cost per policy for administration of the National Flood Insurance Program, to be used in all applicable Corps of Engineers economic evaluations in the indicated fiscal year, or until a new value is furnished.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Average Cost Per Policy</u>
1972	\$50
1973	48
1974	57
1975	54
1976	46
1977	49
1978	45
1979	33
1980	40
1981	39
1982	40
1983	42
1984	51
1985	62
1986	67
1987	85
1988	56
1989	77
1990	79
1991	90
1992	111
1993	112
1994	125
1995	115
1996	122
1997	131
1998	121



Model Agreements

Ellen Cummings – CECW-PM

The new model agreement for the section 206 (aquatic ecosystem restoration) program has been approved, along with revised model agreements for the section 1135 (project modifications for improvement of the environment) program. A memorandum was sent to all of the Chiefs of Planning on 19 February 1998 providing guidance for the use of these models. The models are all very similar. The revisions to the section 1135 models respond to the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 amendments and include the 80 percent limit on work-in-kind and the \$5 million limit on Federal expenditures for any one project, as well as cleaning up a few typographical errors. Two model agreements are necessary for the section 1135 program because one is for those relatively rare occasions when the government agrees to do the operations and maintenance. The model agreements may be found on the Office of the Chief Counsel web page. The address for downloading copies is <http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cecc/ccpca.htm>. Remember that no deviations are permissible unless approved by CECW-AR.

❖

PROMIS Development for Continuing Authority and Ecosystem Restoration Programs

Russ Rangos and Ellen Cummings – CECW-PM

A team of district, division, and HQ representatives has prepared draft work breakdown structure templates for the continuing authority and ecosystem restoration programs. The 4 templates will soon appear as options in the PROMIS system, and be available for loading Section 14, 103, 107, 111, 204, 205, 206, 208, and 1135 projects. The 4 templates, 2 for the "traditional" water resource and 2 for the ecosystem restoration authorities

cover the PDA (planning and design analysis) /construction and feasibility/plans and specs/construction implementation processes.

There will be a phased development and deployment of the program into PROMIS, with full loading of all continuing authority program studies and projects completed by 15 November 1998. Studies and projects already in the system will be converted with minimal reloading or loss of data.

Formal announcements and detailed guidance will be sent by 1 March. Primary points of contact are Russ Rangos, 202 761-0144, and Ellen Cummings, 202 761-8532.

❖

Dual Career Track

Memo signed by LTG Joe Ballard

CEHR-D

29 January 1998

SUBJECT: Dual Career Track

1. The purpose of this letter is clear up some confusion about the USACE position on dual career track. The dual track concept was developed based on the belief that the classification system forces technical people to become supervisors or managers to get higher grades. As a result, this reduced our technical capability and frequently moved people, who do not have management or leadership competence, to supervisory positions.

2. First some background on this issue. In the late eighties the Engineers and Scientist Career Planning Board commissioned a study on how to implement a dual career track for the E&S career program. The study suggested the need for a more liberal interpretation of the classifications standards to increase the number of non-supervisory higher grade positions. Members of the Headquarters staff met with the classification experts at HQDA to discuss the E&S recommendation several years ago and came away with the clear

understanding that Army would not support relaxing standards. In the early nineties USACE was also trying to push a Office of Personnel Management research and demonstration project through the DA/DOD/OPM chain which would have given the command the authority to develop a new classification system for grades 13 to 15. The proposed project was never approved.

3. I have been frequently asked why dual career ladders only exist in our R&D labs. Positions at the labs are classified using the research grade evaluation guide (RGE) while engineers and other professionals performing non-research work are graded by standards for their occupations. The RGE uses four factors, one of which is the qualifications and scientific contributions of the incumbent of the position. This is a grading factor not used in other standards. The rationale for its use in the RGE is that the research situation is much more likely to provide opportunity for full play of the incumbent's capabilities than the frequently more structured and limited non-research situation. Application of the RGE has traditionally resulted in more non-supervisory 13, 14 and 15 positions.

4. USACE has fewer supervisors today as a result of high grade controls and supervisory targets. In October 1991 we had 3032 supervisors and 1354 non-supervisory positions in grades 13, 14 and 15. We currently have 2532 supervisory positions and 2777 non-supervisory positions in those grades. This is a 105 percent increase in 13, 14 and 15 non-supervisory positions. As a result, we have much more of a dual career track today with many more opportunities to advance beyond the GS 12 level without becoming a supervisor. This is true for R&D as well as non-R&D positions. We are aware that a portion of our non-supervisory positions include some that have 25% or less supervisory duties or team leader duties and are not required to be classified as "supervisory." Even so, the number of true non-supervisory GS 13's, 14's and 15's has increased. Many non-supervisory 13's exist at districts and labs. Opportunities for non-

supervisory 14's and 15's exist at labs, division and HQ USACE.

5. Currently, the Office of Personnel Management is working on a new standard to evaluate team leader positions. It has been staffed twice with other agencies and is in final draft. If and when it is issued it would add one grade over the grade level of work led if a position leads subordinates more than 25% of the time. This might provide some grade increases for non-supervisory professional individuals in districts, providing more opportunities.

6. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness) has begun the development of a legislative proposal for an alternative civilian personnel system within Title 5, US Code, which will better meet the needs of the Department. The initiative is in response to a directive from the Quadrennial Defense Review and is the culmination of growing dissatisfaction with the current Government-wide personnel system. Improved pay and classification procedures are among the goals of a new system which also include simplified hiring practices, performance management flexibilities, and more effective workforce shaping tools. The goal is to have a coordinated legislative proposal by March 98, in time for the FY99 submission.

7. I believe the way to ensure a level playing field in this area is to let DOD design alternative personnel systems and that future classification system changes be tied to DOD or HQDA initiatives. USACE will not pursue changing the classification system to achieve more of a dual career track.



Recruitment for Program Manager

Memo signed by LTG Joe Ballard

CEHR-ZE

6 February 1998

SUBJECT: Recruitment for Program Manager (GS-340 Series)

1. When life cycle project management was implemented in the Army Corps of Engineers, our senior position was classified in the GS-340 Series with a title of Program Manager (Engineering & Science). This was based on the belief that experience in one of the engineering and scientific disciplines would be a primary requirement for this key position. It was included in CP18 coverage, and we have been using the central referral inventory for recruitment.

2. Now that we are in a better position to evaluate the requirements of the position, we find that recruitment for this position would be better served by making it a more general

Program Manager, GS-340 Series, without the specialized experience requirement.

Accordingly, I have asked my staff to take steps to move this position from CP18 coverage. This will mean that recruitment actions for these vacancies will be handled by the Civilian Personnel Operations Centers (CPOC), and that interested candidates will apply directly to vacancy announcements. We are working on a standard position description and uniform recruitment plan which we will provide to USACE managers in order to achieve some consistency. This change will be effective 1 April 1998.

3. I urge you to take action now to publicize this important change to your workforce. We will, of course, notify each current registrant in our CP18 central inventory. If you have questions, please feel free to contact Mrs. Louise Crowell of my staff at 202-761-0826, DSN 763-0826.



DEADLINE

The deadline for material for the April issue is 18 March 1998. ❖

Planning Ahead, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, TEL 202-761-1969 or FAX 202-761-1972 or e-mail harry.kitch@usace.army.mil.